

REMARKS

The Official Action has been carefully considered and the Examiner's comments are duly noted. Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully solicited.

In paragraph 2, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9 and 11-12 were rejected as obvious under 103(a) over Hiyama (JP 09098227A), in view of Stovall (US Pat. 6,144,724) and Skigin, et al., (RU 2,105,452). It should be noted that Applicant was aware of Skigin and brought this reference to the attention of the Patent Office.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner has not given any weight to "external" in line 3. Note also, "general" in line 8; Hiyama is a specific, not a general, telephone network as the Examiner notes in line 22 on page 2 "...connected to the local network and to a general telephone network."

The Examiner admits that Hiyama does not have an interface for each telephone set and further that each interface is connected directly to the bus of the local computer network.

The Examiner now brings in Stovall which has a date of 15 May, 1998 and we must conclude from that that Stovall was aware of the Hiyama Patent because it was published on April 8, 1997, more than one year prior to the date of the Stovall disclosure and filing date of May 15, 1998. It is not what Stovall generally teaches, as alleged by the Examiner, but how the teachings of Stovall can be applied to the teachings of Hiyama. There is nothing in Stovall of suggesting a possible combination or any direction to usage or combination with Hiyama.

A consideration of Stovall does not provide any indication or suggestion to do what the Examiner proposes. It is only with the benefit of this disclosure that the Examiner is now aware that there is the possibility of such usage. Once seeing Applicant's disclosure, it now becomes obvious to the Examiner because of Applicant's teachings.

The fact that Stovall discloses a network interface does not provide for the subsequent comments of the Examiner. The issue of obviousness referred to by the Examiner in lines 9 to 15 of page 4 of the Official Action is not objective but subjective to the Examiner and, therefore, Applicant respectfully dissents from the Examiner's conclusion.

Turning now more specifically to the Examiner's comments commencing in line 16 of page 3 and extending to line 8 of page 4, and the conversion of an analog signal to and from a digital signal which is an important feature of which the Examiner admits that neither Stovall nor Hiyama teach, and as clearly understood by the Applicant, have any conception. Applicant has appreciated that, with the possibility of conversion to and from the analog signal to digital signal, a tremendous advance over the prior art could be achieved and provide for a considerable savings in costs.

Clearly, as the Applicant understands the Examiner's comments, and the teaching of the prior art, it would appear that the Examiner may be erroneously alleging that the interface has "a transmission channel and receiving channel; the transmitting channel having a signal detector-distributor ... , a second input of the voice and tone signal transmission priority device being connected to the output of a voice signal transmitter, whose input is connected to the output of a decompressor having its input connected to the processor unit" is destined "to convert analog signal to and from digital signal adapted to the clock frequency of the local computer network".

The indicated totality of features allows for the solution of a problem of connecting a telephone set interface directly to the bus of the local computer network connecting computers (see claim 1).

Stovall may solve the same problem, but otherwise the Examiner replaces the problem for the indicated totality of features.

With respect to page 4, lines 8 to 13 and what is notoriously old, the Examiner points out a well-known character of the following totality of features: "an interface comprising a particular combination of elements including a signal-distributor, a tone

dialing recognition device, ..." for solving a problem (see page 4, lines 16 and 17) "... as taught by Skigin for converting analog-digital signals adapted to the clock frequency of the local network".

According to the Applicant, this assertion is erroneous for the following reasons:

- 1) Skigin fails to consider anywhere "a particular combination of elements" pointed out by the Examiner and also fails to teach anything of the kind; Skigin only defines a totality of features to connect a telephone set to the local network;
- 2) "a particular combination of elements" pointed out by the Examiner is not an integral unit and may not serve "to convert analog-digital signals adapted to the clock frequency of the local network";
- 3) "a particular combination of elements" fails to incorporate "the processor unit" and those features that describe its connection to other elements.
Without these features no problem could be solved.

No one knows where the Examiner has found "a particular combination of elements" and failed to substantiate thereof.

As may be seen from the comments with respect to page 3, line 16 to page 4, line 22, in order to prove obviousness of the claimed (invention as set forth in the disclosed) solution, specific features in the Office Action Summary are selected arbitrarily and they are assigned an arbitrary purpose.

The aforesaid arguments apply to claims 1, 5 and 9.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 4, 8 and 11, which provide for additional patentable features over the prior art, the Examiner, in order to prove obviousness of claims 4, 8 and 11, states in the Office Action in the Summary, and again makes use of Stovall, more precisely "the processor unit" from Stovall. But, it should be noted, in the claimed invention, "the processor unit" is used in combination with other elements (output of a compressor is connected to a processor unit and input of a decompressor is

connected to said processor unit, see claim 1) absent from Stovall. Consequently, “the processor unit” has a different purpose according to the claimed invention and according to Stovall. The Examiner is dissecting the claim, and the inventor did not put all three disclosures on a wall and then select individual elements from each disclosure as the Examiner appears to contend.

It appears that the Examiner has given no weight to and does not consider a connection of “the processor unit” with other elements. Hence, the essential features of the claimed invention are not under consideration, thus leading to an unjustified conclusion as to its well-known character.

The claimed technical solution of the present invention differs from that solution in a Hiyama - Stovall combination by the embodiment of a telephone set interface. In the claimed technical solution a telephone set interface differs essentially from Skigin.

In the Stovall - Skigin combination, a technical solution that will coincide with the claimed technical solution in respect of a telephone set interface is excluded. Stovall and Skigin connect a telephone set to the bus of the local computer network connecting computers in a quite different manner.

Since the Hiyama - Stovall combination does not meet the points set out by the Examiner, and since the Stovall - Skigin combination do not meet the other points set forth by the Examiner, there is no modification possible by the piecemeal selection of elements from Hiyama - Stovall - Skigin which meets the claims of this Application to produce the results and advantages taught by this Application.

With respect to claims 2, 6 and 12, these claims have to be considered in the context of the teachings and limitations of claim 1. In addition, the Examiner’s attention is directed to lines 43 to 45 of column 3 of Skigin, which speaks about the telephone connected to the PBX180 can communicate directly with any of the other telephone devices present on LANA110.

In this respect, no mention is made of the personal computer (PC) 160 which is not a telephony device, see lines 36 to 39 of column 3. In fact, there is no concept of

operation because as column 3 specifically states, it would be necessary to provide a sound card and a head set, see lines 39 to 41, to provide telephone functionality. The Examiner is giving no weight to the limitation – direct – in line 3 of claim 2. This is a clear distinction.

Specifically, the invention is for use of direct voice communications between local telephone line users through general computer networks. Stovall is clearly for a public switch telephone network.

There is no concept or specific suggestion in any of the references of record taken either singly or combined in any valid combination to support the teaching and disclosure of this Application to reduce the cost for using a large number of local telephone lines.

The purpose is to reduce cost and still permit employees to speak with each other without using costly telephone lines intended for communication outside of the office.

There is no specific teaching in the prior art of providing computers in the circuitry between the telephone set and the network to effect programmable control of the data transmission and reception process to maintain communication between users.

The voice messages, according to the teachings of the present invention, are to be transmitted between remote users of local telephone networks which are specifically connected through a general computer network, and not as the Examiner appears to think that it is to use a computer as a telephone as the Examiner appears to indicate in the reference to col. 3, lines 36 to 44 of Stovall. Clearly, once this distinction is appreciated the modification of Hiyama by Stovall does not and cannot take place following the teachings of Stovall. Moreover, Skigin was always admitted as prior art so that there is no real combination of the teachings of Hiyama or Skigin.

Another important distinction of this invention over the combination of prior art that the computers are used at two different local sites so that transmission between the two local sites takes place through the computers and the internal communication among individuals at one site can be extended to the other site and to use the local internal

networks at each site and not the telephone lines for external communication with another telephone subscriber. Clearly, no use is made of the central telephone office.

Clearly, Skigin (RU 2,105,425) is cited and acknowledged as one form of an interface telephone adapter, and no claim is made by the Applicant of this invention of being the inventor of the Skigin interface. The interface is used in the claim to provide for a completely operable structure.

It is also clear that perhaps a whereby clause should be added to the independent claims if the Examiner will permit it and if it will place this Application into condition for allowance. Specifically, the combination of the teachings of the references do not accomplish the following:

- A. Calls within the business office not using outside costly telephone network from the central telephone office;
- B. Calls from one company's business office at one location to another of the same company's business office located at a remote location using computer line and not a central telephone office line as an Internet telephone network or an IP telephone network;
- C. Calls to a general local telephone network;
- D. Calls from the head office to the branch or from the branch to the head office while not using the central telephone office; and
- E. Calls from a telephone set to a computer and from a computer to a telephone set.

Now, what does Hiyama teach?

This disclosure teaches conversion of voice (speech) into voice data and conversion of voice data into speech. Further, use is made of a Lan packet. Various handsets are used to effect the conversion of voice data into speech. Note from paragraph [0018] of the translation, conversation always takes place over the public line or through the central telephone office. Clearly, [0019] indicates that they are talking over the

public line network, not any private line, and there is no direction, suggestion or a hint of a private line anywhere other than in the present Application.

There is no suggestion or teaching or prevision of use of internal networks not using the central telephone office for intra-office communication.

And if one considers the argument put forward by the Examiner in paragraph 3, the Examiner appreciates that the essential features of the invention are not disclosed by Hiyama.

In conclusion, the Examiner then refers to Stovall U.S. Patent 6,144,724 to show the availability of an interface. While Stovall may be concerned with the same problem, the solution provided by the present teachings of this Application is not taught nor suggested by Stovall. Specifically, as pointed out, there is no teaching in Stovall of connecting the telephone set interface “directly to the bus of the local computer network, which network specifically connects the computers to each other” as specifically set forth in claim 1.

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant respectfully incorporates all of the arguments and comments previously made in prior responses.

Applicant respectfully asks for reconsideration and would appreciate a courtesy telephone call from the Examiner to provide Applicant’s attorney with the information as to the Examiner’s view with respect to the additional arguments, and whether the Examiner has any suggested wording to place this Application into condition for allowance.

This response is being transmitted by facsimile as well as by First Class Mail.


If there are any points outstanding, the Examiner’s is also respectfully asked to call Applicant’s attorney to do what is necessary.

If any fees are needed, please charge them to our Deposit Account 50-3108.

Respectfully submitted,

LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By:


J. Harold Nissen
Reg. No. 17283
Telephone No.: 914-723-4300
Fax No.: 914-723-4301